UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/680,980	10/08/2003	Werner Knebel	5005.1061	6488	
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 04/13/2007 RRY P.C.		EXAMINER		
P. O. BOX 525	7		FINEMAN, LEE A		
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2872		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/680,980	KNEBEL, WERNER		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Lee Fineman	2872		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Examiner	Art Unit						
		Lee Fineman	2872						
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
ГНЕ	THE REPLY FILED 06 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
I. [The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
	a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
D)	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO								
-	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)). Which the notition under 37 CER 1 136/3) and the appropriate exte	ension fee have					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mon	ths of the date					
_	of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.								
A B 4 F	Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS									
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);									
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	ow);		·					
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	g the issues for					
	appeal; and/or		vicated alaims						
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected ciaims.						
4 [NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.1		omnliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324)					
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling								
7. 🖸	the non-allowable claim(s). 7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.								
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
	Claim(s) objected to: <u>2,8,9,14-16 and 18</u> .								
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,10,11,13 and 17</u> .								
۸ -	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: FIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a land sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will juit or other evidence	not be entered is necessary					
9. [The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation								
	QUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allow	ance because:					
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).									
	13. Other:								
	<u> </u>		Mulh						
	•	ט" א	14 march 14 b (1994) 20 march 11 march						

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new issues are at the least the proposed claim limitations directed to selectively introducing a mirror.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims as finally rejected do not distinguish the claimed system from the cited prior art.